



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/731,629

12/09/2003

Phyllis J. Michaelides

07002.0053.N

4733

23369

7590

11/16/2006

HOWREY LLP

C/O IP DOCKETING DEPARTMENT

2941 FAIRVIEW PARK DRIVE, SUITE 200

FALLS CHURCH, VA 22042-7195

EXAMINER

SHERKAT, AREZOO

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2131

DATE MAILED: 11/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/731,629

Applicant(s)

MICHAELIDES, PHYLLIS J.

Examiner

Arezoo Sherkat

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 August 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 11, 12, 14-24 and 27-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 9, 10, 13, 25 and 26 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/25/2006</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Response to Amendment

This office action is responsive to Applicant's amendment received on 8/25/2006.

Claims 1-31 remain pending.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 8/25/2006 have been fully considered and they are persuasive to the extent of rendering dependent claims 9-10, 13, and 25-26 allowable upon proper amendment to incorporate them in the independent claims.

Applicant argues, "Gupta fails to disclose a generic system with a database of configuration information".

Examiner responds that Gupta's system is a generic token-based system because tokens/cookies in Gupta's system define path and domain parameters (col. 6, lines 8-15). It is also inherent that regardless of the method of authentication being used by authentication system of Gupta, the user's authentication information, e.g., user name and password, have to be compared with the information retrieved from the database of information, e.g., cookie/token database inherently disclosed by Gupta, in or coupled to the login server (col. 11, lines 25-38 and col. 12, lines 25-40).

Applicant argues, "Gupta fails to disclose obtaining from the database configuration information defining a natural language".

Examiner responds that Gupta's disclosure teaches that the custom page settings (i.e., choice of language is considered to be a custom page setting) are

defined in cookies , and the login server uses such settings for communication with the user during the login process (col. 5, lines 58-67).

Applicant argues, "Gupta fails to disclose a generic system that can be used with multiple authentication systems and obtaining from the database configuration information defining and outbound parameter and sending the outboard parameter to the target application once the authentication system has authenticated the user".

Examiner responds Gupta discloses that the login server can verify (e.g., check and send the result to the application server) that the user attempting to process a request has been authenticated with the login server. Gupta also discloses that after a successful authentication, the session information may be cached in the application server too (col. 13, lines 1-6 and col. 13, lines 20-29).

Applicant argues, "Though Barry's system may contain an authentication system, paragraphs 179-180, it does not disclose or suggest a generic system to integrate a plurality of applications and authentication servers. The system in Barry is built for a single use in the networkMCI Interact application and, as such, Barry does not disclose or suggest editing configuration information regarding login information". Paragraphs 205 to 207 in Barry do not teach editing configuration files.

Examiner responds that Barry discloses when an existing user node 1502c is selected, the edit/add new application options on the menu 1506 is enabled (i.e., therefore, editing the corresponding configuration files is enabled) and disabled according to what applications the user (i.e., the administrator) already has. An

Art Unit: 2131

existing user application node 1502d may be selected to edit/modify/delete options within the application (par. 189).

Applicant argues, "Barry fails to disclose a list of active and inactive targets as his system is wholly internal and operates with a central authorization server that grants entitlements, as opposed to a generic system operating between application and authentication servers".

Examiner responds that Barry discloses that when the customer has been authenticated, the customer is then presented with a list of authorized applications. This list determines which buttons, for example, representing each application are active, thus controlling customer access to products and services (par. 205-206 and par. 186-189).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-8, 11-12, 14-24, and 27-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,226,752 and Gupta hereinafter), in view of Barry et al., (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0216421 and Barry hereinafter).

Regarding claims 1, 14, and 20, Gupta discloses a generic token-based system for integrating a target application on a first server (i.e., application server) to an authentication system for authenticating users of the target application (i.e., Gupta's system is a generic token-based system because tokens/cookies in Gupta's system define path and domain parameters)(col. 6, lines 8-15), the generic system comprising a second server (i.e., login server) coupled to a database of configuration information about a login process for the target application, the second server being programmed to access the database of configuration information to conduct the login process with a user of the target application and to use the authentication system to authenticate the user and to issue at least one token to enable the user to access the target application once the authentication system authenticates the user (i.e., it is inherent that regardless of the method of authentication being used by the login server, the user's authentication information, e.g., user name and password, is inherently compared with the information retrieved from the database of information, e.g., cookie/token database, in or coupled to the login server)(col. 11, lines 25-38 and col. 12, lines 25-40), wherein the second server is programmed to receive a Uniform Resource Locator (i.e., a servlet , on the web server, e.g., application server, can be invoked by a client by a name or a URL) including an identification of the target application (i.e., cookie/token database contains cookies with variety of information such as database information, custom page settings, and parameters such as: name, value, expiration date, **path**, and **domain** of the cookie) (col. 14, lines 27-60), and the second server is further programmed to use the identification of the target application for looking up the configuration information for the

Art Unit: 2131

login process from the database (i.e., wherein it is inherent that the database can be queried using the name of the cookie, corresponding to the websites owner's name)(col. 5, lines 57-67 and col. 6, lines 1-4 and 30-37).

Gupta does not disclose an administrative application program to present a graphical user interface to a system administrator for creating and editing the configuration information.

However, Barry discloses an administrative application program to present a graphical user interface to a system administrator for creating and editing the configuration information (par. 186-189).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify teachings of Gupta with teachings of Barry because it would allow to include an administrative application program to present a graphical user interface to a system administrator for creating and editing the configuration information as disclosed by Barry. This modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by the suggestion of Barry to provides a common GUI for the customer (i.e., administrator) enabling report requesting, customizing, scheduling and viewing of various types of data from different back-end telecommunications service and applications at a single point of customer contact (Barry, par. 0020).

Regarding claims 18 and 27, Gupta discloses a method of using an authentication system for authenticating users of a target application on a first server

(i.e., application server), the method comprising maintaining a database of configuration information about a login process for the target application, and using a second server (i.e., login server) to access the database of configuration information to conduct the login process with a user of the target application and to use the authentication system to authenticate the user and to issue at least one token to enable the user to access the target application once the authentication system has authenticated the user (i.e., it is inherent that regardless of the method of authentication being used by the login server, the user's authentication information, e.g., user name and password, is inherently compared with the information retrieved from the database of information, e.g., cookie/token database, in or coupled to the login server)(col. 11, lines 25-38 and col. 12, lines 25-40), wherein a data network couples the first server to the second server, and the second server receives a Uniform Resource Locator including an identification of the target application and uses the identification of the target integrated for looking up the configuration information for the login process from the database (i.e., wherein it is inherent that the database can be queried using the name of the cookie, corresponding to the websites owner's name)(col. 5, lines 57-67 and col. 6, lines 1-4 and 30-37).

Gupta does not expressly disclose using a graphical user interface of an administrative application to generate the configuration information to define the login process and maintain such configuration information.

However, Barry discloses using a graphical user interface of an administrative application to generate the configuration information to define the login process and maintain such configuration information (i.e., When the StarOE server 39 detects that

Art Unit: 2131

the password has expired, the server 39 notifies the customer, via the client application 154 to change the password. The changed password is sent to the StarOE server 39 formatted in a message interface, "change password request," for example. The server 39 upon receiving the message updates the password for the given user in its user profile stored in StarOE database 160, and responds with appropriate return codes to the StarOE client 154)(par. 162 and 200).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify teachings of Gupta with teachings of Barry because it would allow to include using a graphical user interface of an administrative application to generate the configuration information to define the login process and maintain such configuration information as disclosed by Barry. This modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by the suggestion of Barry to provides a common GUI for the customer (i.e., administrator) enabling report requesting, customizing, scheduling and viewing of various types of data from different back-end telecommunications service and applications at a single point of customer contact (Barry, par. 0020).

Regarding claim 31, Gupta discloses a method of integrating a third-party web application to a centralized authentication system, said method comprising:

creating an authentication module (i.e., AuthHttpServlet class) for the third-party web application (col. 14, lines 34-45); and

storing the configuration information in a database (col. 12, lines 54-58);

redirecting a user login request from the third-party web application to a server containing the authentication module (col. 12, lines 13-24); and

upon receipt of the user login request, the server activating the authentication module to retrieve the configuration information from the database to conduct the login process and to use the authentication system for user authentication, and then issuing a token for enabling user access to the third-party web application (col. 12, lines 25-61).

Gupta does not expressly disclose a system administrator using a graphical user interface of an administrative application to generate the configuration information to define the login process and maintain such configuration information.

However, Barry discloses using a graphical user interface of an administrative application to generate the configuration information to define the login process and maintain such configuration information (par. 162 and 200).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify teachings of Gupta with teachings of Barry because it would allow to include a system administrator using a graphical user interface of an administrative application to generate the configuration information to define the login process and maintain such configuration information as disclosed by Barry. This modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by the suggestion of Barry to provides a common GUI for the customer (i.e., administrator) enabling report requesting, customizing, scheduling and viewing of various types of data from different back-end telecommunications service and applications at a single point of customer contact (Barry, par. 0020).

Regarding claim 2, Gupta discloses the generic system as claimed in claim 1, wherein the authentication system is a centralized authentication system of a business organization, and the target application is in a third-party web server coupled by a network to the centralized authentication system (col. 11, lines 10-25).

Regarding claim 3, Gupta discloses the generic system as claimed in claim 1, wherein the server is programmed to issuing at least one token (i.e., cookie) to enable the user to access the target application once the authentication system has authenticated the user (col. 11, lines 10-25).

Regarding claim 4, Gupta discloses the generic system as claimed in claim 1, wherein a data network couples the target application to the server, the server is programmed to receive a Uniform Resource Locator (i.e., a servlet , on the web server, e.g., application server, can be invoked by a client by a name or a URL) including an identification of the target application (i.e., cookie/token database contains cookies with variety of information such as database information, custom page settings, and parameters such as: name, value, expiration date, **path**, and **domain** of the cookie), and the server is further programmed to use the identification of the target application for looking up the configuration information from the database (i.e., wherein it is inherent that the database can be queried using the name of the cookie, corresponding to the websites owner's name)(col. 5, lines 57-67 and col. 6, lines 1-4 and 30-37).

Regarding claims 5, 15, 21, and 28, Gupta discloses the generic system as claimed in claim 1, wherein the second server is programmed to obtain from the database configuration information defining an inbound parameter, and the second server is programmed to receive the inbound parameter from the target application (i.e., the application server checking directly with the login server to verify the authorization of the user by providing inbound parameters such as temporary identifiers)(col. 12, lines 62-67 and col. 13, lines 1-6).

Regarding claims 6, 16, 22, and 29, Gupta discloses the generic system as claimed in claim 1, wherein the second server is programmed to obtain from the database configuration information defining a natural language (i.e., custom page settings are defined in cookies in token/cookie database), and the second server is programmed to use the natural language (i.e., the custom page settings) for communication with the user during the login process (col. 5, lines 58-67).

Regarding claims 7, 17, 23, and 30, Gupta discloses the generic system as claimed in claim 1, wherein the second server is programmed to obtain from the database configuration information defining an outbound parameter, and the second server is programmed to send the outbound parameter to the target application once the authentication system has authenticated the user (i.e., the login server can verify,

e.g., check and send the result to the application server, that the user attempting to process a request has been authenticated with the login server)(col. 13, lines 1-6).

Regarding claims 8 and 24, Gupta does not disclose presenting a graphical user interface to the system administrator for creating and editing the configuration information, and the graphical user interface includes pages for listing active and inactive target applications integrated with the authentication system, and pages for creating and editing a selected one of the target applications.

However, Barry discloses wherein the administrative application is programmed to present a graphical user interface to the system administrator for creating and editing the configuration information, and the graphical user interface includes pages for listing active and inactive target applications integrated with the authentication system, and pages for creating and editing a selected one of the target applications (i.e., When the customer has been authenticated, the customer is then presented with a list of authorized applications. This list determines which buttons, for example, representing each application are active, thus controlling customer access to products and services)(par. 205-206 and par. 186-189).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify teachings of Gupta with teachings of Barry because it would allow to include the graphical user interface including listing active and inactive target applications integrated with the authentication system (i.e., controlling customer access to product and services), and pages for creating and

editing a selected one of the target applications as disclosed by Barry. This modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by the suggestion of Barry to provides a common GUI for the customer (i.e., administrator) enabling report requesting, customizing, scheduling and viewing of various types of data from different back-end telecommunications service and applications at a single point of customer contact (Barry, par. 0020).

Regarding claim 11, Gupta does not disclose presenting a graphical user interface to the system administrator for creating and editing the configuration information, the administrative application includes a series of action modules for presenting respective pages of the graphical user interface to the system administrator, and the action modules are programmed for invoking business logic.

However, Barry discloses wherein the administrative application is programmed to present a graphical user interface to the system administrator for creating and editing the configuration information, the administrative application includes a series of action modules for presenting respective pages of the graphical user interface to the system administrator, and the action modules are programmed for invoking business logic (par. 234-245).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify teachings of Gupta with teachings of Barry because it would allow to include wherein the administrative application is programmed to present a graphical user interface to the system administrator for creating and

Art Unit: 2131

editing the configuration information, the administrative application includes a series of action modules for presenting respective pages of the graphical user interface to the system administrator, and the action modules are programmed for invoking business logic as disclosed by Barry. This modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by the suggestion of Barry to provides a common GUI for the customer (i.e., administrator) enabling report requesting, customizing, scheduling and viewing of various types of data from different back-end telecommunications service and applications at a single point of customer contact (Barry, par. 0020).

Regarding claim 12, Gupta discloses the generic system as claimed in claim 1, wherein the second server includes a data cache coupled to the database (col. 12, lines 54-58).

Regarding claim 19, Gupta discloses wherein the authentication system is a centralized authentication system of a business organization, and the target application is in a third-party web server (i.e., application server) coupled by a network to the centralized authentication system (col. 11, lines 25-67, col.12, lines 1-7), and the login process includes redirection of a user login request from the third-party web server to a server (i.e., login server) accessing the database and the centralized authentication system (col. 12, lines 7-67 and Col. 13, lines 1-19).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 9-10, 13, and 25-26 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Shaw et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,362,836), and

Fang et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,243,816).

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2131

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Arezoo Sherkat whose telephone number is (571) 272-3796. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30 Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

A.S.
Patent Examiner
Group 2131
November 12, 2006


AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100